

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application, based on the following remarks, are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-10 are cancelled and new claims 11-19 are added to more fully claim the disclosed invention. Support for new claims 11-19 may be found in the originally presented figures, claims and specification. Claims 11-19 will be pending in this application.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brochu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,711,006, in view of Alperovich et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,078,804. Applicant has cancelled claims 1, 3-5 and 7-10. Therefore, the rejection with respect to those claims is moot. With respect to newly added claims 11-19, Applicant submits that those claims are allowable because the combined teachings of Brochu et al. and Alperovich et al. fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in those claims.

For example, the combined teachings of Brochu et al. and Alperovich et al. fail to disclose, teach or suggest a method of "transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber in connection with a request for routing information," as recited in claim 11 (and claims 12-13 by virtue of their dependency from claim 11). Similarly, the combined teachings of Brochu et al. and Alperovich et al. fail to disclose, teach or suggest a mobile communication system comprising "transmitting means for transmitting an identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber in connection with a request for routing information" as recited in claim 14 (and claims 15 and 17 by virtue of their dependency from claim 14).

With respect to independent claim 16, the combined teachings of Brochu et al. and Alperovich et al. fail to disclose, teach or suggest a VMSC comprising "a second interface toward a home location register for receiving an identity of the calling subscriber in connection with a request for routing information relating to the called subscriber; and a third interface toward the called subscriber ... for transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber obtained from the home location register to the called subscriber" as recited in claim 16 (and claim 19 by virtue of its dependency from claim 16). With respect to independent claim 18, the combined teachings of Brochu et al. and Alperovich et al. fail to disclose, teach or suggest a home location register comprising "a first interface ... for receiving an identity of the calling subscriber; a ... VMSC, for requesting routing information relating to the called subscriber and for transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to said VMSC" as recited in claim 18.

To the contrary, the previous Office Action acknowledged that Brochu et al. fails to disclose transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber via signaling, the signaling occurring either over a path different from the speech connection or at a time prior to call set-up between the calling subscriber and the called subscriber. However, that Office Action cited Alperovich et al. as teaching that “before routing an emergency call set up request signal received from a mobile subscriber toward a particular emergency service terminal, subscriber specified data associated with that particular subscriber are retrieved,” including signaling occurring either over a path different from the speech connection or at a time prior to call set-up between the calling subscriber and the called subscriber. This is because the Office Action asserted that Alperovich et al. teaches signaling occurring at a time prior to call set-up between the calling subscriber and the called subscriber.

However, claims 11, 14, 16 and 18 recite signaling occurring over a path different from the speech connection, and not signaling occurring at a time prior to call set-up between the calling subscriber and the called subscriber. Thus, the combined teachings of Brochu et al. and Alperovich et al. do not teach independent claims 11, 14, 16 and 18 (and dependent claims 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19).

Therefore, the prior art of record does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed systems and methods performing operations in connection with requests for routing information.

Thus, Applicant submits that newly presented claims 11-19 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Further, the Applicant provides the following further arguments with regards to new claims 13, 17 and 19. Although previously the Office Action indicated that Brochu et al. allegedly disclosed the claimed MAP PROVIDE\_ROAMING\_NUMBER MESSAGE by forwarding a ROUT REQ (INVOKED) message from HLR to VLR (in its rejection of cancelled claim 8), Brochu et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest a method further comprising “transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber in a MAP PROVIDE\_ROAMING\_NUMBER MESSAGE” as recited in claim 13. With respect to claim 17, Brochu et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest a VMSC “operable to receive the identity of the calling subscriber in a MAP PROVIDE\_ROAMING\_NUMBER MESSAGE.” With respect to claim 19, Brochu et al.

fails to disclose, teach or suggest a home location register "operable to transmit the identity of the calling subscriber in a MAP PROVIDE\_ROAMING\_NUMBER MESSAGE."

To the contrary, Brochu et al. merely teaches that "an incoming call 30 ... to a mobile subscriber ... is routed to an originating system 10 having a gateway mobile switching center (G-MSC) 14 and a home location register (HLR) 16 .... If the subscriber is within an area served by a visiting system 20, a visiting location register (VLR) 22 receives a routing request (ROUTREQ) invoke message 34 from the HLR 16." (Col. 3, lines 53-62). Applicant notes that "the subscriber" quoted above from Brochu et al. is the called subscriber, and that Brochu et al. merely discloses conventional routing request (ROUTREQ) messages. Such conventional usage of a routing request message relates exclusively to the called subscriber.

Therefore, Brochu et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed method and apparatus of transmitting and/or receiving the identity of the calling subscriber in a MAP PROVIDE\_ROAMING\_NUMBER message as recited in claims 13, 17 and 19.

Thus, Applicant submits that newly presented claims 13, 17 and 19 are allowable over the prior art of record.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the claims are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

By: 

Christine H. McCarthy  
Reg. No.: 41,844  
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2143  
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

CHM/ASW/smm  
1600 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 905-2000